
From the Editor

Getting Started

In starting to write this message, I was struck by the fact that one of the hardest things of writing an article is getting started. To capture a reader's interest, make a case for the value of an article, and still quickly get to the core of one's ideas can be difficult to accomplish. A common technique authors employ to get their articles started is to provide vague statements about how current practices are weak and how the present article will provide some valuable solution. Indeed, most articles and the research on which they are based stem from observed weaknesses in current practice, and the implications frequently indicate valuable solutions. Consequently, offering a global statement regarding industry weaknesses—specific, general, vague, or otherwise—may seem like a good introduction, as it sets up the topic of the article and indicates where the author thinks the article can make a substantive contribution. The problem with such an approach, however, is that such introductions generally provide unverifiable or inaccurate representations of the sophistication of professionals in the hospitality industry. Blanket statements such as “the industry has never” or “hotel managers frequently ignore” are just two common examples of over-generalizations that are certainly not verifiable and, therefore, are simply unwarranted. While I understand that such statements are usually made for the purpose



Michael C. Sturman

of writing an introduction or trying to justify some specific research, this approach is overly simplistic and inaccurate.

There is no denying that there are “worst practices” in any industry, but the hospitality industry is certainly staffed by a significant share of managers who are well educated, deeply experienced, and just plain intelligent. Indeed, the target audience of this journal is sophisticated individuals who are involved with or interested in the hospitality

industry and who have the desire and capacity to apply research to advance practice in their domains. Our readers are well informed, and many often have far broader experience bases than many of our authors. The nature of research often requires individuals with specific in-depth knowledge in one area to tackle a specific problem. The benefit of the journal is for readers with generally broader responsibilities or who lack the time to make such in-depth investigations to learn from these focused efforts.

By submitting work to the *Cornell Quarterly*, authors are trying to communicate the implications of a focused research effort to an audience that can appreciate it. It is thus inconsistent and unnecessary to introduce those articles by suggesting, implicitly or explicitly, that the audience has failed to exhibit sophisticated thinking in the past. Certainly, the information should be new, and perhaps even outside of the audience's

current consideration, but if the research is truly well done, this should not be a surprise to the authors. If an author is trying to publish something that is new, as indeed is much of the mission in academe, she or he

should not lament that the audience has not thought about it already. Indeed, *CQ* readers are specifically seeking the next good idea—and they expect to find it in the *Quarterly's* pages.—*M.C.S.*